



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
29-30011-01	04/28/99	FACHL	UB00011-3

MICHAEL R BOYER
ORSCHELN MANAGEMENT CO
2900 US HWY 60 SOUTH
MOBERLY MO 65270

IM22/1108

EXAMINER

FOELAK, M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED:

11/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

---The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address---

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/25/00
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1 — 23 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1 — 23 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1711

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cary et al in view of Cary et al taken with Wycech et al and Kagoshima et al.

Note that while Cary et al do recite whether the phosphoric acid used in their process is water free, it is deemed that patentees or anyone skilled in the art would use water free acid if water interfered with curing reaction. In any case there is no evidence on record to show that commercial available phosphoric acid would interfere with the curing reaction. Note also that in col. 4 lines 50 et. seq. where patentees discuss the use of boron trifluoride as a quick acting curing agent can be slowed down by an amount of water defined in the instant specification by applicants when they define the term "substantially" thus indicating that the more anhydrous the curing agent the faster its curing ability. In response to applicants' argument that superatmospheric pressure is used in order to foam there epoxy resins note col. 12 lines 56 et. seq. where it is indicated that the epoxy foams of their invention can be foamed at atmospheric pressure due to the exthermicity of the curing and foaming reaction. Applicants arguments with regard to the secondary references have been considered and it is deemed that the secondary references have not been used in combination with the primary reference to show the claimed process but to show that the claimed blowing agent, thermoplastic resins and the separation of the

Application/Control Number: 09/300,930

Art Unit: 1711

resin are notoriously well known in the art and to use these materials in the process of the Carey et al reference would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the art.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/300.930

Art Unit: 1711

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Morton Foelak at
telephone number (703) 308-2442.

M.F.

Nov. 18, 2000


MORTON FOELAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER